

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 8

FEBRUARY 27, 1956



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

On The Need for Allowing A Little Trade in Virgins

A *Reuters* dispatch from Versailles says the Consultative Assembly of the French Union has ordered a full investigation of reports that slaves are being taken in French Africa and sold in Saudi Arabia. According to Emmanuel le Graviere, who made a preliminary report to the Assembly, the main item of trade is in young Negro virgins under 15. These he said "bring from 200,000 to 400,000 francs (about \$570 to \$1140) each in Saudi Arabian slave markets."

This could involve troublesome diplomatic complications. The French government can be expected to act only after consultation with its allies in London and Washington. But private organizations of a less responsible character are already at work. Two days after this *Reuters* dispatch from Versailles, the *New York Times* (Feb. 21) carried a cable from London saying that Charles W. Greenidge, secretary of the Antislavery and Aborigines Protection Society was preparing a report for submission to the United Nations Economic and Social Council in April on what he described as an increasing traffic by "Saudi Arabian slave dealers, seeking concubines for the harems of wealthy customers." Apparently one result of the oil boom is that Saudi Arabians are now able to afford better stocked harems.

The Practical Considerations

This is not funny. Aside from the morally repugnant aspects of trade in human beings, there are wider, serious and more practical considerations to be kept in mind. Our lease on those bomber bases in Saudi Arabia expires in June. Negotiations for renewal will not be made easier if in April a debate is precipitated at the United Nations on this delicate subject. The honor of our good and dear friends in Saudi Arabia will inevitably be involved. The reluctance of the Saudi Arabian government to discuss this question at all is apparent from the London dispatch. This quotes Mr. Greenidge as saying that both Saudi Arabia and Yemen "have not answered repeated United Nations and other inquiries concerning slaves, although both are member nations." There is the danger of a showdown between the UN on the one side and Saudi Arabia and Yemen on the other.

We bring this up in an effort to alert the State Department in time. Is there some way to postpone this investigation until after the bomber base leases are signed? What position will our government take if this spring it must stand up and be counted for or against Saudi Arabia? Cannot steps be taken to prepare public opinion if practical necessities require us to take a somewhat broad view of the slave trade? It would be disastrous if we vacillated. It would damage us perhaps irreparably were some shipment of African virgins to be held up on the Zambesi or the Congo by a last-minute switch of policy from Washington, only to have the girls reloaded two days

later when Saudi Arabia insisted in an ultimatum which could only be summarized as, "no girls, no bases, no oil."

It would be well if Mr. Dulles, wherever he is, could be summoned home for consultation. His Under Secretary, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., as an experienced oil man, can be trusted to see this situation clearly. But Mr. Dulles has so stressed the moral and Godly aspects of our foreign policy as to create some difficulties in preparing to take a practical position. These difficulties are not, however, insurmountable. The first step should be to summon as soon as possible a series of those private briefing sessions at which representatives of leading American organizations are prepared in advance to understand our government's foreign policy, which is sometimes confusing to the lay mind.

No Spiritual Danger

It must first be made clear that the spiritual welfare of these girls is in no danger; the Moslems into whose homes they will come believe in God as devoutly as we do. Indeed for many of the poor creatures this transfer of title (as so skilled a lawyer as Mr. Dulles might term it) will mark a distinct spiritual advance, since these virgins come from Equatorial Africa where many of the tribes are still pagan and have no knowledge of the one true God whom we and the Moslems both worship, *Allah Ilahu*. (Prayer rugs might be spread at this point in the briefing; Aramco, we are sure, would be glad to supply them on loan to the State Department for the purpose).

The briefing sessions should enable Americans to see this matter in perspective and in the way it appears to allies living in a different culture. There is little on which the Saudi Arabian can spend his oil revenues; he soon tires of Cadillacs. The nights in Arabia are long and dull. The Moslem, leafing through his Scripture, like a listless travelling salesman thrown back on his Gideon Bible for amusement in some one-horse town, reads of Solomon (blessed be his name!) and his thousand wives and concubines. His Koran promises him in the after life a paradise of houris. Our diplomats and oil men tell him that oil revenues can build him a paradise on earth. But for a pious Moslem, reading his scripture literally, like a Methodist fundamentalist in our own beloved Mississippi, paradise is not paradise without those virgins. Would it not be impious, almost atheistical, to interfere with the ancient customs and devout pastimes of our Saudi Arabian allies?

Of course the professional politicians of the NAACP, like the Zionists on similar occasions, may be expected to protest this effort to reconcile national interest with the highest moral and religious principle. But are we to endanger bomber bases, oil reserves, and the solvency of the sterling bloc for the sake of domestic politics?

The New Walter Hearings and the Goldie Watson and Watkins Cases Pose An Old Question:

Is Defamation of Character A Proper Legislative Purpose?

Could a Congressional committee ask a bank president whether he ever committed larceny—and explain that it was only asking in order to frame better laws against theft? Could it subpoena citizens and ask them whether they ever committed adultery on the excuse that Congress was studying the divorce problem? Would it not be recognized that the asking of such questions cast an indelible stain, that the power of investigation was being used as an instrument for defamation? Would it not be seen that while a legislature may make laws on larceny and divorce, the job of enforcing them against individuals belonged to grand juries, operating in secrecy to protect reputations from unwarranted charges, and to the courts?

This is an issue the Supreme Court has dodged ever since it refused to hear the *Hollywood Ten* and *Barsky* cases. This is the issue with which it will be confronted again now that the Court of Appeals here has granted the government's petition for a rehearing before its full bench of the 2-to-1 Watkins decision which held that the House Un-American Activities Committee could not hold a witness in contempt for refusing to give it the names of persons he had known in the Communist party. The witness in that case had pleaded neither the First nor the Fifth; he had admitted past membership; he refused to name others on moral grounds. Judges Edgerton and Bazelon upheld him on the ground that a legislative committee has no right to ask questions purely for the purpose of "exposure."

Aid to What Kind of Education?

In so ruling the two liberal judges of this circuit struck at the very heart of the witch hunt. Martin Dies at its very beginning declared it his purpose to act as a roving public grand jury. The idea was to punish by infamy those who could not be reached by the criminal law since they were guilty of no crime but holding views a Congressional committee thought "un-American." This was and remains far from any normal legislative purpose. This was evident again when the government was challenged the other day in the Goldie Watson case to explain the House Committee's legislative purpose in questioning that Philadelphia school teacher (who pleaded the First). One of the lame theories put forward by the prosecutor was that Congress might want to know about

her possible Communist past and associations in order to help it decide on the aid to education bill! (Judge Schweinhaut has asked for briefs on the point to help him make his decision.)

The purpose of defamation was again apparent in last week's House Committee hearings when four lawyers who worked for the National Labor Relations Board in the late 30's or early 40's were questioned. The range of questions put by Chairman Walter and Counsel Richard Arens swung in a wild buckshot orbit. One question dragged in the name of a man who had earned their enmity by heading up a committee to study revision of the McCarran-Walter immigration act which Arens helped to frame. One line of questioning seemed to imply that the NLRB's anti-company unionism was the product of Communist conspiracy. Another line of questions smeared the Israel bond drive.

Investigating Israel Bonds?

A witness refused to name those who got him a job in that drive, pleading the Fifth as his protection. After a long line of harassing questions about his own views and those of others, he asked the committee not to draw unwarranted inferences from his use of the Fifth. Walter, with almost savage pleasure, said he would draw any inferences he liked. What business is it of a Congressional committee who is hired by a private bond drive? The real purpose here is to deprive radicals, present, past or suspected, of livelihood and to frighten any employer from hiring them.

The hearings also gave the House committee an excuse to put into the pillory a member of the last Washington law firm which still has the courage to defend the rights of Communists, real as well as alleged. In asking David Rein, a member of Forer & Rein, about his political views and those of his wife, the committee was able to settle scores with a lawyer who has often represented witnesses before it. This is a particularly obnoxious form of intimidation, since it inhibits the right to counsel. These hearings into the NLRB's past are the fruit of a form of blackmail; men like Herbert Fuchs were led to testify against others under the threat of perjury prosecutions for failing to disclose past Communist membership on government personnel forms. This is dirty business. It remains for the Supreme Court, in a changing climate, to call a halt.

"Too Many Americans Neglected Their Own Sick and Wounded"

Army Psychiatrist Denies Torture Was Part of "Brain Washing"

Q. Most people have the idea that prisoners who were brainwashed were subjected to tortures such as starvation, solitary confinement, etc. Was there much of that?

A. No, this third [a third of all U.S. prisoners in Korea admit they turned "progressive" in Communist camps, according to Major Mayer] that I am talking about were not subjected to physical torture, according to their own statements.

Q. So you don't count torture as an essential part of brainwashing?

A. Definitely not. . . .

Q. Did the Japanese try brain-washing our prisoners in World War II, or did the Germans?

A. As long as we understand precisely that by brainwashing we are simply using a coined word to apply to an indoctrination and education process, I can say that every prisoner-holding power in every major war has engaged in this kind of activity. This is permitted under the Geneva convention. The Communists simply went about it more intensively, more systematically. . . .

Q. Didn't the Americans take care of their sick and wounded?

A. Of course they did, in many cases. But, in a disturbingly large number of instances, evidently they did not. The reluctant conclusion must be drawn that this fact is the principal one in explaining the deaths of the hundreds of Americans who failed to survive. . . .

Q. Do you mean that these prisoners expected to be tortured, and then, when they were treated with seeming kindness instead, they were more prone to accept the Communists' ideas?

A. Yes. . . .

Q. Did they try to make prisoners into Communists?

A. Never. One of the largest areas of public misunderstanding has related to just this problem. . . .

Q. Why was that?

A. . . . From the very beginning, they told these soldiers they merely wanted to show them the truth as they saw it, and they wanted to enlist these soldiers as fighters for peace. . . .

—Interview with Major William A. Mayer, an Army psychiatrist who questioned nearly 1,000 U.S. soldiers captured by the enemy in Korea, during a four year study of "brain washing," *U.S. News & World Report*, Feb. 24.

U. S. Army Chief Says "Unrestricted Nuclear War May Be Total Disaster for All Participants"**So Why Not Try to Stop the Race for Weapons Too Dangerous To Use?**

Those papers, like the *New York Times*, which depended on the Associated Press for coverage omitted the most important part of the testimony given the Senate Armed Services Committee last Monday by U.S. Army Chief of Staff Maxwell D. Taylor. This was Taylor's statement that it was becoming "increasingly apparent that unrestricted nuclear war may be total disaster for all participants."

Unfortunately the official synopsis issued to the press by the committee after the session, which was held behind closed doors, gave no more than this short cryptic quotation on this point. It was supplemented, however, by an excerpt from the testimony of Secretary of the Army Wilbur M. Brucker. The latter, obviously rebutting Air Force talk of a quick, short war, told the committee a new war "may be a long, desperate and exhaustive struggle."

The purpose of the testimony and the unusual release of a synopsis was to plead against Army cuts. While General Taylor said the Army wanted atomic weapons, he said that in the main world trouble spots where limited wars were likely to break out, "Any military action . . . would be essentially a land operation with a very limited role, if any, for weapons of mass destruction."

Taylor did not name these "trouble spots" but obviously places like Korea, Indochina, Cyprus, Israel, or even Germany are too small for using the new weapons of mass destruction without destroying ally and enemy alike.

But the main point made by General Taylor, that "unrestricted nuclear warfare may be total disaster" for both sides raises a crucial question. If these new weapons are too dangerous to be used by either side, why not negotiate an agreement not to use them and thus ease tension? And why go on developing new weapons of the same kind, like an intercontinental ballistic missile with a thermonuclear warhead?

This new terror involves new unsolved technical problems. A ban on further thermonuclear tests would make it impossible to test one with a thermonuclear warhead. Thermonuclear tests are detectable and therefore a ban on them would be self-enforcing. Krushchev in his speech of Feb. 24 to the Soviet Party Congress offered "pending agreement on the major questions of disarmament . . . cessation of tests of thermonuclear weapons." Why can't Nehru ask the Pope to follow up on his Christmas message with a new appeal to U.S. and U.S.S.R. to negotiate such a moratorium? It would be a first step in easing world tension.

Perspective on Missiles

"The Russians today have plenty of medium range bombers that have all the [U.S.] bases in Europe that we are talking about within their range, and that have the capability of delivering atomic bombs against bases with more precision than we can expect them to have with a ballistic missile for some time to come. Therefore, they know and we know that the mere addition to their arsenal of the 1,500 mile missile to do the same job would not materially affect the balance of power between the two blocs. . . . And they know that the addition of even an intercontinental [ballistic missile] of any accuracy that they are apt to have within the next decade will be only a marginal advantage to them over their bomber force and not a completely new and revolutionary thing. . . . The point that I am making then is that we have gotten this thing completely out of perspective. We have scared our people to death about something that is, to be sure, a horrifying weapon; but it does not kill you any deadlier than a bomber does with an atomic bomb; and nobody is going to start a war because they have this kind of weapon unless they can see a way out that will avoid destruction to themselves, and the addition of this weapon to their arsenal whether or not we then have it will not avoid destruction to themselves . . . we are recognizing it as a very potent addition to our arsenal, but we are not recognizing it as a weapon that will revolutionize warfare, whichever side gets it first."

—Donald A. Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force, testifying before a House Appropriations subcommittee.

A main obstacle is opposition from Britain, which does not want to stop tests until it has an IBM with a thermonuclear warhead of its own. The *Times* of London in an editorial Feb. 18 said this was "a sad gloss on the state of Anglo-American relations" since Britain would merely be duplicating U.S. efforts. The Atomic Energy Act prevents the U.S. from giving such nuclear secrets even to an ally as close as Britain. But must the British for reasons of prestige have this terrible and expensive military toy? Its use would be the end of countries as small in area as Britain.

Most of Nation's Press Ignores Petition for Basic Review of Foreign Policy

Except for the *New York Times*, most of the nation's press and the wire services ignored a petition to Congress and the White House last week-end for "a fundamental review" of foreign policy. The petition signed by 100 Americans, including 46 editors and clergymen, was initiated by Miss Emily Greene Balch, Dr. Henry F. Grady, Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson and E. Raymond Wilson.

The petition said events since the summit meeting last July showed that "the alternative to peaceful competition is too horrible to contemplate." It said "the will to negotiate must be emphasized so that the Spirit of Geneva will not die." It declared "Our allies have been critical of our reliance mainly upon a system of military aid and global military alliances." It urged that the time had come "to prove with the ploughshares of peace which economic system can bring greater benefits to the peoples who now look to the industrial giants, whether capitalistic or communistic, for aid in promoting their welfare."

"It is with a sense of disappointment," the petition said,

"that we note the failure of the big powers to respond positively and with alacrity to the Christmas Message of Pope Pius XII in which he decried the immorality and inhumanity of nuclear warfare and suggested a negotiated ban on the use of such weapons. We also regret recent unfortunate references by our Secretary of State to 'brink of war' diplomacy. The spirit of give and take is the only assurance that we may all LIVE AND LET LIVE. [Capitals in original, IFS.]

"Our President," the petition went on, "was profoundly impressed with the need for all of us to avoid discouragement merely because our own proposals, our own approaches, and our own beliefs are not always immediately accepted by the other side." Whatever criticism one may have of the Soviet position at the Geneva Foreign Ministers Conference, according to Walter Lippmann, "Western terms at Geneva had in them no room for maneuver, no material for bargaining, no chance for trading." Our own policies must be infused with imagination and a creative new approach."

McCarthy Opposition Collapses and Hennings Committee Gets \$100,000

Senator McNamara Introduces Bill to Repeal Taft-Hartley Oath

A bill (S. 3187) to repeal Section 9 h, the non-Communist oath provision of the Taft-Hartley Act, has been introduced (almost unnoticed in the press) by Senator McNamara (D. Mich.) and referred to the Senate Labor committee. . . . Though Senator Hennings spoke of investigating secrecy in government in asking the Senate to give his Committee on Constitutional Rights another \$100,000 last week, the committee can investigate any threat to the Bill of Rights. McCarthy's threatened fight against further funds for Hennings collapsed and the money was approved unanimously. . . . CIA On The Brink, Too: Resentment against John Foster Dulles is building up strong support for the Mansfield bill to subject his brother's CIA to Congressional watch dog supervision. . . . The neutralist majorities in the North Rhine Westphalia and Greek elections also did not help the Dulles brothers.

Four Steps Forward: The private school that Senator Eastland's children attend, Sidwell Friends, will start admitting Negroes next year. . . . Et, Tu, Perle?: Mrs. Perle Mesta, former Minister to Luxemburg, is back from a visit to Formosa where she was the guest of the Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang. Mrs. Mesta told the D.C. Business and Professional Women's Club at a "brunch" last Sunday she found the firm belief of the Nationalists that some day they'll return to the Chinese mainland "a little pathetic." . . . Strategy: The Johnson-Knowland bipartisan alliance first tried to protect the natural gas lobby and themselves by *narrowing* the investigation into the charges by Senator Case. Now, their strategy is to bury the gas scandal by *broadening* the investigation to cover "all" lobbying, controlling the committee to make the inquiry and arranging for no report until after the elections.

Will Leader Lead? Political scuttlebutt in Washington increasingly swings to the view that a dark horse candidate will get the Democratic nomination. Young, progressive George Leader, Governor of once solidly Republican Pennsylvania, with the fourth largest electoral vote, has become a possibility. . . . New Dixiecrat Movement? As tension rises over the integration issue, it is hard to see how the Democratic party can avoid taking a stand strong enough to compete for the pivotal Negro vote in the North. But any such stand this year may easily push the respectable leaders of the party in the South, the Georges, Russells and Byrds into a new and greater Dixiecrat movement. . . .

Repeal of the Smith Act: Prof. Alexander H. Frey, president of the Greater Philadelphia Branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, has written a letter to Senator Hennings calling for the repeal of the Smith Act on the ground

The Balloon In Our Own Eye

The simple way to figure out the balloon situation for yourself is to imagine the uproar in this country if the Russians were sending balloons with photographic equipment over the United States and explaining that they were only taking pictures to study the weather! Balloons equipped for studying the weather can also be utilized for aerial espionage and the only reasonable conclusion is that if such weather study is useful, it ought to be carried on by the United Nations. International study is also called for into the problem of "freedom balloons." Here, again, the subject is simplified by imagining our reactions if heavy loads of printed matter were being dropped on our air lanes by Soviet balloons on the excuse that they had a moral right to encourage the American proletariat to hope for eventual "freedom" from "capitalist oppression!" These headlines about the balloon flights having been "stopped" were deceptive. Only weather balloons were involved in that decision, the stoppage was only "provisional" and the promise merely that we would "seek to avoid" (why not "stop" if that's what we mean?) "the launching of additional balloons, which on the basis of known data, might transit the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" (note sent Moscow, Feb. 8). This is vintage double-talk.

that prosecutions for mere membership in the Communist party open the way to mass arrests. . . . "Protests Increase Against Shipping Tanks to Arabia," screamed a banner headline across the top of page 1 in last Monday's *Daily Worker*. But Soviet war planes for Egypt, we suppose, are just doves of peace. . . . Soviet Footnote: The disturbing thing about the "thaw" visible at the Communist Party Congress in Moscow is that everything is still being done unanimously. . . . Caveat to the Press: The Senate Internal Security Committee is still itching for an inquiry into the press. Its ex-counsel Sourwine made the mistake of starting with the *New York Times* and lost his job in the uproar; his shrewder successor, Robert Morris, is starting at the other end, with *Tass*. . . . That article we promised on the SACB had to be held up till next week.

Obituary: We regret the death of Mrs. Katherine Van Orden, former head of the League of Women Shoppers and Progressive party candidate for Senator from New Jersey in 1952; hers was an untiring devotion and an unfailing sweetness of spirit. . . .

Copies of This Issue Are Not Being Mailed to Subscribers in Saudi Arabia, Yemen or Lower Eritrea

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:

2/27/56

(To) Name

Street

City Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S. E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office